

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Interview

The Applicants thank the Examiner for her courtesy and consideration in discussing this Application in a telephone interview on May 31, 2006. Specifically, the Examiner and Applicants discussed independent claims 1 and 14, and the rationale for certain lines of rejection. While no specific areas of agreement were reached, the reasoning behind the rejections was explored. This discussion is reflected in the amended claims submitted herewith, as the amendments are intended to overcome the areas of concern raised by the Examiner.

*Interview
Record OK
6/5/06*

Amendments

Before this Amendment, claims 1-27 were present for examination. Claims 1, 13, 14, 22, and 23 are amended. Claims 15, 16, 25, and 27 are canceled; and new claim 28 is added. Therefore, claims 1-14, 17-24, 26, and 28 are present for examination, and claims 1, 14, 22, and 28 are the independent claims. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13, 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of the article by Caruso entitled "Children's Hospital Shines Light on Net Problems" (hereinafter "Caruso"). The Office Action rejected claims 14, 15, 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,919,239 to Fraker (hereinafter "Fraker"). The Office Action rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraker in view of U.S. Patent 5,930,342 to Mazzapica (hereinafter "Mazzapica"). The Office Action rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraker in view of book by Gralla entitled "How the Internet Works" (hereinafter "Gralla"). The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection, Caruso

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13, 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caruso. Claims 1 and 22 are the independent claims to which this rejection